

REMARKS

Upon entry of the claim amendments, Claims 1-5 and 8-10 will be all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 as supported by the description at the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9, the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13, page 13, lines 19-21, the paragraph bridging pages 19 and 20, and page 25, line 4, of the specification, as well as original Claim 7.

Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

New independent Claim 10 is supported by, for example, the description at page 25. Furthermore, new Claim 10 includes all of the recitations of Claim 1.

The remainder of the amendments render dependent claims consistent with amended Claim 1.

No new matter has been added.

Referring to Section No. 3 at page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner requests a new title for the invention.

In response, Applicants have amended the title of the invention.

Referring to Section No. 4 at page 2 of the Office Action, Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In response, Applicants have amended Claim 2. Amended Claim 2 satisfies each and every requirement of §112. Withdrawal of the §112 rejection is requested.

Referring to Section No. 6 at pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,828,903 ("US '903") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,511,944 ("US '944").

AMENDMENT

U.S. Appln. No. 10/698,549

Amended Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the combination of US '903 and US '944. For example, amended Claim 1 recites subject matter previously recited in Claims 6 and 7, which were not included in the present §103 rejection.

Regarding the subject matter of dependent Claim 3, US '903 is silent with respect to the presence of platinum in the ferromagnetic metal powder of the magnetic recording layer.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claims 1-3.

Referring to Section No. 7 at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US '903 in view of US '944 as applied to Claims 1 and 2, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,484 ("US '484").

Claim 4 depends from amended Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the combination of US '903, US '944, and US '484. For example, amended Claim 1 recites subject matter previously recited in Claims 6 and 7, which were not included in the present §103 rejection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claim 4.

Referring to Section No. 8 at page 5 of the Office Action, Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US '903 in view of US '944 as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,619,856 ("US '856").

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a removable magnetic recording medium which is a removable disc medium for use in a magnetic recording system utilizing an MR head. As recited in Claim 1, the diameter of the disc medium is from 20 mm to 50 mm.

If the claimed recording layer was simply applied to a disc medium having a small diameter, the following three problems (i) to (iii) would arise:

AMENDMENT

U.S. Appln. No. 10/698,549

- (i) if the diameter of the disc medium is small, the linear velocity between the head and the disc medium is lowered, so that the floating height of the head over the disc medium is decreased, i.e., abrasion of the head increases;
- (ii) if the diameter of the disc medium is small, the stiffness of the support and, thus, of the disc medium as a whole increases, as described at the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 of the specification, thus increasing the risk of head jumping; and
- (iii) if any element (device) is exposed to the surface of the MR head, its structure is weak against abrasion.

In order to solve the above problems (i), (ii), and (iii), the removable magnetic recording medium of Claim 1 uses polyethylene terephthalate or polyethylene naphthalate as a support, as these materials are relatively soft in comparison to, for example, polyimide, which is sometimes used in the prior art. Furthermore, the thickness of the support in the removable magnetic recording medium of Claim 1 ranges from 30 μm to 70 μm , thus allowing an appropriate balance between stability and stiffness of the support. Still further, by using the combination of layers recited in Claim 1 and by employing the undercoat layer having projections as recited in Claim 1, the sliding property of the disc medium of the removable magnetic recording medium of Claim 1 is improved.

In contrast, the recording layer as suggested in US '903 is produced by a coating procedure, as taught at column 4. However, the coating type medium contains an abrasive, such as $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ as an essential component. $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$ results in an increase of the abrasion of the recording head. As a result, US '903 provides a teaching which is unsuitable for a system using an MR head, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate that the subject matter of Claim 1 relates to a thin film type medium, rather than to a coating type medium as taught by US '903. Therefore, the abrasive referred to in US '903 would not appear at the surface of the disc medium recited in Claim 1.

AMENDMENT

U.S. Appln. No. 10/698,549

Still further, US '903 is directed to particulate materials (the magnetic layer contains ferromagnetic metal particles), which is different from the present invention, in which ferromagnetic metal alloy (not particulate material) forms the magnetic layer.


None of US '944 and US '856, alone or in combination, provides any further relevant teaching concerning the subject matter recited in Claim 1, and therefore, none of US '944 and US '856, alone or in combination, cures the deficiencies of US '903.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claims 5-9.

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



L. Raul Tamayo
Registration No. 47,125

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 28, 2005